284 953

REMARKS

ON THE

TRAVELS

OF THE

MARQUIS DE CHASTELLUX,

IN

NORTH AMERICA.

LONDON,

Printed for G. and T. WILKIE, in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

MDCCLXXXVII.

[Price Two Shillings.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE ſtorm of war has long ceaſed; the tumult that has ariſen from it is gradually ſubſiding; the voice of reaſon begins to be heard; and prejudice bears an unintentional teſtimony to truth.—Struck with theſe reflections, on reading the Travels of the Marquis de Chaſtellux, I offer ſome remarks upon them to the Public: his account of America ſtrengthens many aſſertions relative to the late war, that have hitherto been diſbelieved; points out who were the enemies of Great Britain; what inſtruments ſeparated her from her colonies; and produces the moſt ample evidence in favour of the

military talents of the Britiſh generals. Every page of this work bears with it the undeniable teſtimony of a ſoldier, citizen, or philoſopher, that the Britiſh ſubject enjoys a greater ſhare of happineſs at home than he could find in a wild purſuit of it in America.

The Marquis de Chaſtellux's Travels are accompanied by the notes of his Tranſlator, of whom I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak hereafter. Upon military points, I frequently agree with the Marquis: where I differ, I collect my information from Britiſh officers who ſerved in America. Whatever is included between inverted commas is taken from his Travels.

Literary Society

REMARKS

ON THE

MARQUIS DE CHASTELLUX'S

TRAVELS.

THE Marquis de Chaſtellux was a French major-general, and in that capacity went to Rhode Iſland with the army under the command of M. Rochambeau; all his intelligence, of courſe, was derived through a medium ſo oppoſite to the intereſts of Great Britain, that he can only be conſidered as furniſhing an *ex parte* evidence for the judgment of ſome hiſtorian; and he too muſt not be of the preſent age, as the Marquis juſtly remarks: "It is for a Salluſt and a Tacitus alone, ſays he, to tranſmit, in their works, the actions and harangues of their contemporaries; nor did they write till after ſome great change in affairs had placed an immenſe interval between the epocha of the hiſtory they tranſ-

 mitted,

mitted, and that in which it was compoſed."

The Marquis's teſtimony is frequently favourable to the Britiſh armies, from whoſe merit, it is obvious, he aims to detract; and indeed it was politic for him to do ſo, as printed copies of his work were circulated at Paris during the war, the flattering contents of which in all probability echoed to America. Speaking of the ſtrength of Mud Iſland, the Marquis remarks, "When we recollect the innumerable obſtacles the Engliſh had to ſurmount in the preſent war, it is difficult to aſſign the cauſe of their ſucceſſes; but if we turn our eyes on all the unforeſeen events which have deceived the expectations of the Americans, and fruſtrated their beſt concerted meaſures, one cannot but be perſuaded that they were devoted to deſtruction, and that the alliance with France alone proved the means of their preſervation." There never can be a greater panegyric beſtowed on the Britiſh generals than what this ſentence contains; innumerable obſtacles they did ſurmount, and it did not depend on them to cruſh the naval power of France.

The

The Marquis, in viewing the redoubts thrown up by the Britiſh in front of Philadelphia, remarks on the defect of the poſition; and he might have related that the houſes, which he takes care to mention as deſtroyed near that ſpot, were thrown down to ſtrengthen it. He then ſays, "At every ſtep one takes in America, one is aſtoniſhed at the ſtriking contraſt between the contempt in which the Engliſh affected to hold their enemies, and the extreme precautions they took on every occaſion." There cannot be a greater proof of military talents in a commander in chief than this obſervation.

The Marquis ſays, that "the Engliſh attack conſiſts in general in a briſk fire rather than in cloſing with the enemy." This French officer is unacquainted with the theory of the Britiſh army; and to apply with the ſtricteſt truth his own words to one of its generals, "the many unforeſeen events that deceived their expectations" prevented ſir Henry Clinton from inſtructing him and the French troops at Rhode Iſland in its practice.

The limits of this pamphlet preclude me from entering into the detail of the leſs important events of the war. Suffice it to obſerve, that the Marquis has been much miſled in the account that he relates of them; and what he ſaid in raillery to M. Fayette, on one occaſion, may in ſober ſeriouſneſs be applied to him and his other military informers on all, "He was a Gaſcon as well as the reſt of them." When the Marquis de Chaſtellux relates that he was at the houſe where lord Cornwallis came to take Mr. Lincoln, he forgets to recount that, although his lordſhip miſſed the general, he took what was better, his cannon.

The eſcape of Mr. Waſhington from Trenton, and that of the marquis de la Fayette, are not juſtly related: it is certain they did eſcape, and the Marquis does not praiſe them for being placed where flight was neceſſary for their preſervation. To his remark on the battle of Brandywine, I only add, that darkneſs prevented the purſuit; and had it not, it muſt have been ineffectual, for Mr. Waſhington wrote a letter that night many miles from the field

field of action, and the gentlemen of France, whoſe engagements in the Rebel ſervice at this time were contrary to the laws of nations, were not leſs panic-ſtruck: they were flying, and on their journey conſidering whether it would not be better for them to retreat by the Ohio to the Miſſiſſippi, and ſo to Old France: they expected that the people of the country would riſe up againſt them; not being able to foreſee that a ſevere and more than tropical rain, a few nights after, would "fruſtrate the beſt concerted meaſures" of ſir William Howe, and preſerve Waſhington's army from deſtruction *.

At

* The Marquis is in doubt whether the Britiſh troops, who paſſed Chadsford, were in one or two columns. Though I have failed in my enquiries relative to this point, I have met with an anecdote that may illuſtrate his account, and deſerves to be made more generally known. The Marquis was informed, that the redoubt which Mr. Waſhington had thrown up to cover Chadsford, "could not be taken, unleſs turned." Lieutenant-colonel Moncrief, then captain, was in the front of a column, which advanced to a redoubt: there was a howitzer in it, loaded with grape ſhot, pointed directly towards the column, and a man ſtanding by it with a lighted match in his hand; colonel

At the affair of German Town, the Marquis blames general Waſhington's intentions, as being beyond his force; here we moſt perfectly agree: the execution of his deſign can be well explained from the Marquis's recital: "A thick fog came on, favourable to the march, but which rendered the attack more difficult, as it became impoſſible to concert the movements, and extend the troops." He adds, "The Engliſh piquet were ſurpriſed, put to the rout, and driven to the camp." The fact is, a battalion of light infantry and the fortieth regiment were in advance; the piquet guard was driven in by the enemy; nor could it be ſuppoſed that two battalions ſhould withſtand, or were meant to withſtand, an army; they retreated alſo, and the enemy poſſeſſed themſelves of their camp; under the cover of the fog, and, in conſe-

colonel Moncrief, with his uſual preſence of mind, called out, "I'll put you to death, if you fire:" the man threw down the match, and ran off; had he fired, he could equally have eſcaped, and in all probability colonel Moncrief had not lived to diſplay his energy and abilities in the defence of Savannah and the conqueſt of Charles Town.

quence

quence of their numbers, they had nearly turned the right of the fortieth regiment, when colonel Muſgrave ſhewed his military talents, and deciſive application of them, by throwing himſelf and his battalion into Chews Houſe. General Waſhington loſt time at this houſe; but had he immediately advanced, he would have found the Britiſh army in order of battle, and ready to receive him; they, however, could not leave their poſition to attack, till the fog cleared up: as ſoon as this happened, they did advance, and general Waſhington and his people fled on all ſides *. The Marquis de Chaſtellux only ſays, "The piquet was ſurpriſed, and fled," (it fled of courſe, and this is rather a proof it was not ſurpriſed); but the tranſlator heightens the expreſſion, and applies it to the army; and then affirms the Marquis calls it "a complete ſurprize," and goes on to queſtion the evidence which ſir George Oſborne gave in the houſe of

* This precipitate flight occaſioned an officer to ſay, upon the field of battle, "Waſhington may write a ſhorter letter to Congreſs than he did after Brandywine; he may copy Cæſar's words, with a ſlight alteration, *Veni, vidi*, fugi."

commons,

commons, " That the army was not ſurpriſed at German Town;" a teſtimony which, if it was neceſſary, could now be confirmed by whole regiments. I am ſorry that the gallantry of the aſſault made upon Red Bank by colonel Donop meets with no applauſe from an officer: indeed it needs none; its plain recital is ſufficient: nor can the hiſtory of the war among the contending nations, exhibit any thing parallel to the undaunted reſolution and perſeverance ſhewn in that unfortunate attempt.

On what principle does the Marquis de Chaſtellux remark, " That the gallows ought to be the reward of the exploits of thirty ſoldiers, or regimented tories, who, detached with the Indians, had burnt upwards of two hundred houſes, and deſtroyed above one hundred thouſand buſhels of corn?" Does the *French Nobleman* condemn theſe men for loyalty? Or does the *Officer* think the deſtruction of one hundred thouſand buſhels of corn no object of military expedition? No loſs to an army, which is deſcribed to have been frequently in the utmoſt want of food? Or muſt they ſuffer becauſe they act with Indians? How

exalted then muſt be the gallows for M. Fayette, who made uſe of theſe people, not in a frontier country, where the inhabitants are more ſavage and barbarous than the Indians, but, as M. de Chaſtellux informs us, within fifteen miles of the city of Philadelphia!

As the following pages will contain obſervations more of a civil than a military complexion, I ſhall now introduce the Tranſlator to the notice of my readers. He ſtyles himſelf an "Engliſhman;" I can ſcarcely believe him. He relates his having been in "the ſeventeenth regiment;" that he had been "an apprentice to a London merchant, a Swiſs, who was violent in his approbation of the government-meaſures againſt the Americans, and ſupplied them ſecretly with gunpowder;" that he had ſerved on board an "American privateer, with wretches of every deſcription;" that he was "in the Texel and in America during the war;" he alſo adds, that he ſaw the camps in England: if ſo, he probably viſited them upon that ſame honourable motive which brought M. Fayette to London, long after he had determined

to enter into the ſervice of the Congreſs. If he be an Engliſhman, his own reprobation of White may ſuit him, whom he deſcribes as going over to the enemy, and "diſtinguiſhing himſelf by every act of virulence againſt his country."

The war has ceaſed, but not with the Tranſlator: his buſineſs is to vilify the Britiſh army, whoſe officers, he affirms, broke their parole; but that "out of reſpect to their families, he does not mention their names." He alſo ſpeaks of a "Britiſh chaplain, as dividing plunder" on the march through the Jerſeys. He affects to "bluſh for England:" if he really felt for the honour of that country, he would mention names, and not by concealing them be injurious to the whole community; but ſtories like his are improbable in themſelves, and will not be believed on the anonymous aſſertions of one, who, by his own account, has acted both as a lurking ſpy and avowed rebel to his country. The Tranſlator heightens the ravages of the Britiſh army to the greateſt degree, and the good diſcipline of the French is ſpoken of with enthuſiaſm: the ſituation of the armies admitted of no compariſon;

to

to form one, we muſt take the Britiſh troops as they now are marching from town to town in England; the French army had no enemy to oppoſe, and the way was ſmoothed before them. Reſentment againſt the ſuperiority of the Britiſh arms in the former war inflamed their hopes, and policy regulated their conduct: on the contrary, the Britiſh army, when no enemy dared to oppoſe them in the field, were yet fired upon by a ſkulking peaſantry, whom no laws, or uſage of European war, could juſtify; their characters were aſſaſſinated by ſuch inſtruments as the Tranſlator, while rebel America affected to be aſtoniſhed that war brought with it any depredations or miſeries.

The Marquis de Chaſtellux ſeems to have caught the political contagion: for him, and thoſe who think like him, it will not be improper to relate ſome of the ſufferings of Germany in the former war, from the diſcipline of France and the avarice of its general: if the troops of that ambitious country are now under a better diſcipline, and the ſentiments of their generals are as delicate and ſenſitive as thoſe of the Mar-

quis de Chaſtellux, the pandects of Quebec, Minden, and Roſbach have produced admirable effects, and Wolfe, Ferdinand, and Frederick have been moſt uſeful lawgivers.

I ſhall give a ſummary character, from the Annual Regiſter, of the conduct of the French army in Hanover, in 1757; a narrative that, in the hands of the marquis de Chaſtellux, would have been ſpun out into pages, could they detract from the glory of Great Britain. "The moſt exorbitant contributions were levied with the moſt inflexible ſeverity; every exaction which was ſubmitted to, only produced a new one ſtill more extravagant, and all the orderly methods of plunder did not exempt them from the pillage, licentiouſneſs, and inſolence of the French ſoldiery." The baron Germingen, in a memorial preſented to the diet of the empire, ſays, "the damage of the firſt invaſion was ſeveral millions, they made a ſecond invaſion, exacted inſupportable contributions, plundered ſeveral places, &c. the *ſole end* of *which* was *to ravage the king's dominions* and *thoſe of Heſſe* *." A Frenchman, the ſlave of his govern-

* Vengeance ſoon overtook another army of French, equally

government, ſacrifices every thing to the politics of his king; I am not ſurpriſed therefore at the indiſcriminate cenſure that the marquis de Chaſtellux beſtows upon the Engliſh generals and armies; it is his endeavour to make them odious: this poſſibly he thought became a Frenchman; but an Engliſhman, the member of a free government, would be inconſiſtent with its principles, did he not ſelect, to the beſt of his power, the deſerving from the unworthy; did he not, in this preſent inſtance, add his teſtimony to thoſe eulogiums which the peo-

equally remarkable for their cruelty; and the immortal Frederick, according to their own Voltaire, met them at Roſbach, where

Aux plaintes de la Germanie
L'Orgueil François eſt ecraſe.

" Depredatory expeditions is a term too ſhameful to be made uſe of in the vocabulary of war," ſays the Tranſlator. The paſſage I have quoted proves it not to be new, and it ought to be remembered that the *prudent* Turenne either burnt the Palatinate, or could not prevent his troops from doing it, through their reſentment, and without orders. Expeditions of the Britiſh troops, which the Tranſlator calls *predatory*, were made to deſtroy *privateers*, and their arſenals; as the Tranſlator was not of their councils of war, it is among his abſurdities to preſume to give the ſentiments of its members, which neceſſarily were *ſecret*.

ple of Hanover beſtow on the military virtue and good faith of the duke of Randan.

Much of the ravages in America was attributed to the Heſſians: it was certainly difficult to inculcate into them that the country ſhould enjoy the advantages of peace, the inhabitants of which were in arms againſt them; and who hourly violated the regulations which Europe has adopted to leſſen the calamities of war. A very reſpectable officer of the Heſſians obſerved, and it was not contradicted by any of thoſe preſent who had ſerved in Germany, "that even the allied army, when it drove the French marauders from Heſſe, pillaged the country more than the Heſſians or Britiſh did America;" and added he, with great indignation, "no American town has been laid under contribution, and what is there to deſtroy? wooden houſes deſerted of their inhabitants, pigs, and poultry."

The marquis's Journal bears teſtimony to the real poverty and the fancied magnificence of America. An European, upon looking on the maps of Britiſh America, miſtakes capital letters for cities, and the ſize of ſome diſtrict or townſhip for a large town. From the

the Marquis he will learn, that he and his ſuite could ſcarcely be accommodated with proviſions at an immoderate price; and he will then eſtimate the difficulties that an army muſt have laboured under for ſubſiſtance in the country. The Tranſlator ſpeaks to its almoſt impoſſibility, when lord Cornwallis's army receded from Rivers; and ſurely this alone muſt excuſe ſoldiers for taking proviſions wherever they could find them; it being an avowed maxim of European war, to live upon an enemy's country. In general, the Britiſh armies were ſupplied with proviſions from England; an immenſe operation! but which proves the little inclination that its government had to carry on the war in its utmoſt rigour, and that it did not conſider its revolted colonies as enemies; that it did not look upon them as the duke de Richelieu did on the unhappy inhabitants of Hanover, or as Mr. Waſhington and the provincial aſſemblies did on the Tories, as they politically termed them, whoſe whole property they confiſcated, and whoſe perſons they baniſhed. Charles Town, near Boſton, was burnt during the heat of action, and it was neceſſary in a military light;

Houſes

Houſes and forage ſuffered the ſame fate in the vicinity of Boſton, by general Waſhington's army; they too conſumed the houſes in the neighbourhood of White Plains. Theſe, and many others, were military operations; but Norfolk in Virginia, unneceſſarily burnt by their back-woodſmen, contained in it more houſes and a greater property than the licentiouſneſs of the Britiſh ſoldiers ever deſtroyed.

The Loyaliſts are mentioned in this work with the utmoſt calumny and hatred: this their principles, ſo different from thoſe of the Author or Tranſlator, naturally account for—The tranſlator ſays, "the Loyaliſts ravaged ſome parts of America it is true; but ruined England, by inſpiring her enemies with an irreconcileable hatred." The irreconcileable hatred to England was inſpired by the "enlightened few *." Such incendiaries as the Tranſlator may add fewel to it; but, by the bleſſing of God, the ruin of England is not likely to be the reſult of their wiſhes.

* This is the Tranſlator's term for thoſe "few," who, according to the Author, led the Virginians into revolt, and, agreeable to the Tranſlator, formed the government of North Carolina.

I beg

I beg now the attention of the readers of the marquis de Chaſtellux's Travels, to the numbers of the Britiſh and Iriſh whom the Tranſlator's notes point out as holding the higheſt poſts in America, and to his obſervation that the latter poſſeſſed as much energy at leaſt, and ſerved that country "with as much enthuſiaſm in the cabinet and the field as the native Americans, and, to ſpeak with the late lord Chatham, they infuſed a portion of new health into the conſtitution." Attend alſo to his remark on Mr. Waſhington's army, for it is a true one; "*this army* was *compoſed* of *all nations*; yet they ſeem to be pervaded but by one ſpirit, and fought and acted with as much enthuſiaſm and ardour as the moſt enlightened and determined of their leaders." What inferences ſhall we deduce from this account? Shall we ſay that theſe Iriſh leaders, that this army was pervaded with that true ſpirit of liberty, which is the reſult of liberal education and of virtuous principles, of a cool judgment and a warm heart; and that it was called forth to action by individual diſcernment in the one, and perſonal ſufferings in the other? Or ſhall we ſay that the

former were reſtleſs adventurers; who, having nothing to loſe, had nothing to riſk: and who, from "ſmall beginnings *," aimed at the poſſeſſions of the Loyaliſts? That the latter, an aſſemblage of all nations, were collected together from neceſſity, coaleſced through fear of puniſhment, and were preſerved in their union by ſevere and uniform diſcipline? *Theſe are the facts*— Their army was under a more than Pruſſian diſcipline; I ſpeak not of its mode, but of its ſpirit; and nothing leſs than ſuch a diſcipline could poſſibly have held together the outcaſts of Europe, and the banditti of the univerſe †, I detract not from the worldly wiſdom of their leaders; I controvert their claims to public virtue and in-

* The Tranſlator's expreſſion of Mr. M'Clenachan, who bought Mr. Chew's houſe.

† Theſe expreſſions are not too ſtrong, they will bear the ſtricteſt examination. The ſober emigrant retired into the interior countries, or joined the Britiſh army; the felons of England, the adventurers of the continent, and thoſe Hearts of Steel, and White Boys, who fled from the juſtice of Ireland, formed this army, which, under the pretext of liberty, had as many well-wiſhers to it as were diſſaffected to the government of church and ſtate in Great Britain.

tegrity:

tegrity: I admire the ſpirit and ability of Romulus; but I deteſt his fratricide, and the principles of his companions.

To underſtand, and to account for this diſcipline, it is neceſſary to remark that the civil government of the ſeveral ſtates was infinitely ſubdivided, and diffuſed throughout the whole continent; that by this the militia was called out into the field, and the continental army was ready to puniſh, and in many caſes did ſeverely puniſh, any delay in obeying its ſummons. The militia once out, it formed an horizon round their camps, as uſeful in a military view to prevent ſurprizes, as the light troops of an European army; but their utility was of higher import, they greatly prevented deſertion, from the reſpective ſituation of the armies difficult in itſelf, and acting on the principles of ſelf-intereſt they effectually checked marauding, that bane of all armies. The civil government, in the mean time, fined, whipt, baniſhed, and hung without mercy, all who oppoſed their reſolutions; they ſeized the preſs throughout America, and in the moſt infamous manner managed it to their purpoſe; they moulded many to

their views by inflaming their paſſions; to ſome they ſold the properties of the Loyaliſts at a low price, who thenceforward became attached to their intereſt; others were connected to it through fear of puniſhment, or dread of retribution; and the whole force of America, civil and military, combined to place in Mr. Waſhington's hands a more ſevere, ſyſtematic, and uniform mode of diſcipline over his *mercenary army*, than any European potentate in the time of war can avail himſelf of.

In ſupport of the obſervation of the Tranſlator, that Waſhington's army was compoſed of all nations, not of *native Americans*; and of my poſitions, that the civil and military powers were cloſely connected with, and moſt ſtrongly aſſiſted each other; the marquis de Chaſtellux gives the deſcription of one colony, "ſpeaking of the revolution unhappily with regret," and of the numbers who were diſaffected to it in others; he mentions alſo "Mr. Pendleton, chief juſtice of Carolina, having the courage to hang three Tories at Charles Town, a few days before the ſurrender of the town, and was accordingly in great danger of loſing

ing his life, had he not escaped out of the hands of the English, though comprised in the capitulation." He informs us, likewise, that when Mr. Harrison had persuaded the people of Virginia to take his word for it that the congress acted properly, "he, Mr. Harrison, found himself greatly relieved by a speech made by lord North, soon after this speech was printed (properly garbled without doubt), and the public papers and all America rang with its contents."

The marquis says, "governor Clinton is inexorable to the Tories, whom he makes tremble, though they are very numerous *:" and well might he, for the British government executed no man through the war for his civil principles; yet what province, what county, what town in America, has not some dreadful truth to relate of Loyalists

* Mr. Payne, in his famous publication of Common Sense, previous to the declaration of independency, says, "a line of distinction should be drawn between English soldiers taken in battle, and inhabitants of America taken in arms. The first are prisoners, but the latter are traitors. The one forfeits his liberty, the other his head." As the British government did not proceed upon these principles, nothing but conscience could make Pendleton think it proper to escape from Charles Town.

executed

executed for offences againſt laws to which they had not aſſented, and by a power whoſe legality they had always denied? More perſons were put to death by the hands of the executioner, in obedience to the rebel legiſlature, than ſuffered a ſimilar fate from both parties, during the civil wars of Charles the Firſt's reign *.

Nor was this the whole that the unfortunate Loyaliſts ſuffered; upon them murder was let looſe; mobs and the virulence of demagogues were fomented by the magiſtrates, to deſtroy thoſe whom no pretexts of their laws could reach; and this happened not in the barbarous and diſtant parts of the continent, but in commercial towns, and in colonies on the vicinity of the ſea-coaſt. Nothing but a wiſh to place truth in its real light, and to reſcue the Loyaliſts from the infamous aſperſions thrown on them by the enemies of Great Britain, could draw theſe remarks from me; but the inſtances of theſe murders are ſo numerous, and the proofs ſo ſtrong, that ſhould they

* France became the pander to American cruelty, and ſometimes the executioner of its political puniſhments.

be

be produced, it would be confeſſed that modern times are ignorant of ſuch another catalogue, and Europe would bluſh for its American offſpring. The Tranſlator relates an inſtance of murder in the back country, which amidſt all his palliatives and artifice, will make an European ſhudder, and which is even worſe than all the calumnies, were they true, that he and his author have ſhed upon the Loyaliſts, and the Britiſh generals and armies.

" The inhabitants of the back frontiers of Penſylvania, goaded to fury by the ravages of the Indians, took the field; in one of their excurſions they fell in with a ſmall tribe of Chriſtian Indians, called the Muſkingaws, who being ſuſpected of attachment to the Americans, had been for ſome time confined at Detroit, and were releaſed only on condition of obſerving a ſtrict neutrality; theſe unhappy wretches, to the number of two hundred, returning to their habitations, were employed in putting their ſeed-corn into the ground, when they were ſurpriſed by the American militia; in vain did they urge their ſituation, and their ſufferings from the Britiſh; they were Indians,

and

and their captors men who had loſt, ſome brothers, fathers, wives, and children in this horrid war; no other plea was neceſſary to palliate their meditated vengeance. The Indians were all ſhut up in a barn, and ordered to prepare for death, but with this barbarous conſolation, that as they were converted Chriſtians they ſhould be allowed a reſpite till the next morning; the innocent victims ſpent the night in ſinging Moravian hymns, and other acts of Chriſtian devotion, and in the morning were led, men, women, and children to the ſlaughter, and butchered by their fellow-worſhippers of the meek Jeſus. The Moravians at Bethlehem and Nazareth, whoſe miſſionaries had converted them, made ſtrong repreſentations to congreſs on the ſubject. I was at Philadelphia when the news arrived, and it is but juſtice to ſay that horror was painted on every countenance, and every mind was at work to deviſe expedients for avenging this atrocious murder; but, after various efforts, both congreſs and the aſſembly of the ſtate were found unequal to the puniſhment of theſe aſſaſſins, who were armed, diſtant from the ſeat of government, the only ſafeguard and

protection of the frontiers; and from their own ſavage nature alone fit to cope with the dreadful enemy brought into action by the Britiſh." So far the the Tranſlator.

"The all-ſeeing eye of divine juſtice alone can diſcover and make known the authors of ſuch a crime; but if diſcovered, Oh! for the voice of Stentor, and the trumpet of Fame, to devote the vile perpetrators to preſent and future horror, and to anounce to all ſovereigns and generals in chief, that the enormities which they tolerate or leave unpuniſhed will accumulate upon their heads, and at ſome future time render them the execration of a poſterity, ſtill more ſenſible and more enlightened than we are yet." This is a reflection of the marquis de Chaſtellux, but not by him applied to this paſſage. It is in the French manner, and I think it will appear proper in the opinion of the Engliſh reader as I have placed it: here it is a more applicable execration againſt thoſe "hunters of men," the armed aſſaſſins of congreſs, the ſavages of the back-countries, than as it was denounced by the marquis on the ſpectacle of a ſingle event of this war.

The Marquis relates that he met with a

man pale in appearance, and whoſe wife ſhewed to him a piece of his ſkull that had been cut out; and he was informed that the man had received fifteen or ſixteen wounds with a hanger. "I was the more concerned, ſays the Marquis, to learn that it was after he had received his firſt wound and was made priſoner that he had been ſo treated." Then follows the exclamation I have recited. Any ill uſage of priſoners is certainly unwarrantable, and infamous to a degree; ſuppoſing it to be proved, and not depend upon this man's own account, that he had ſurrendered; and that after ſurrendering, as many of his countrymen did, he had not again made uſe of his arms; or that ſome ruffian had executed this villainous outrage upon him; ſtill it appears to me that the Marquis's vivacious language is but ill applied to a general or a ſovereign, unleſs their orders had directed ſuch cruelties, or that they were endowed with ubiquity to prevent them, and did not make uſe of it. I therefore think I have done the Marquis' ſentiments juſtice, in adapting them to a reprobation of cool, diſpaſſionate, unprincipled murder, not acted in heat of blood, but after

ter a more than diabolical conſultation. Nor was even this atrocious murder of the Indians ſingular; a full and well atteſted narrative has appeared in the newſpapers, of a Britiſh major, whoſe name I am ſorry I have forgotten, being murdered with other priſoners, many days after he was taken; and theſe deeds of blood were frequently repeated in detail upon the Loyaliſts; ſo that it is no wonder that they ſhould be irritated, to wreak upon Huddy*, a wretch marked with a thouſand crimes, the vengeance due to their ſlaughtered countrymen, and calculated for a better purpoſe than vengeance; the preventing future barbarities. That this principle was a juſt one, let the marquis de Chaſtellux teſtify, who, in the caſe of the thirty regimented Tories, before mentioned, ſays, "they ought to have been executed; but the enemy having alſo made ſome priſoners, repriſals were dreaded, and theſe rob-

* The Loyaliſts felt equally, at leaſt as other men, for captain Aſgill's ſufferings, and they equally rejoice in that young gentleman's being reſtored to his friends and country, after exhibiting in his unfortunate ſituation an heroiſm that his companions bear teſtimony of, and which the United States, in all their records, cannot parallel.

bers were only confined in rigorous and cloſe impriſonment." If the government of Great Britain retaliated upon no man, it proves that its hopes were to reclaim, not to deſtroy; and let thoſe who arraign its want of firmneſs, reſpect its clemency.

The marquis de Chaſtellux blames general Burgoyne for burning a houſe of Mr. Schuyler; the Tranſlator produces general Burgoyne's account of the matter; and military judges will leave to the Marquis his choice of being a malignant narrator, or an injudicious officer: nor ſhould I here mention this matter, but to draw from the Tranſlator's character of that general, a reaſon why Great Britain was unſucceſsful in the war. "The Tranſlator knows general Burgoyne to be a ſoldier of honour, who in that capacity never wiſhes to forget the paramount duties of a citizen and a man." The people of England reaſoned as men may well be ſuppoſed to do, who are bleſſed by nature and their own ſpirit with ample protection from the injuries of internal war; long may they be ſo! They felt every wound inflicted on America, and ſhrunk from its bare recital; and, from their compaſſion and

generous

generous wiſhes, they ſeem to have believed that confuſion was capable of all the mild ſelections of order, that war might be adminiſtered without individual calamity, and that the duties of peace were ſtill paramount. America acted differently, " Hoſtis, hoſtem occidere volui," ran through her whole proceedings, it ſharpened the axe of her aſſumed juſtice, and pointed the dagger of her aſſaſſination. She left the well-known line of the poet, its application, and inefficacy to her mother country,

" Parcere ſubjectis & debellare ſuperbos."

Great Britain accepted of it, and directed the operations of mercy to precede thoſe of conqueſt. This anticipation principally loſt her America.

I join in the marquis de Chaſtellux's obſervations on Mr. Read; *I know*, in the proſperous ſituation of the Britiſh affairs in 1777, and before the unhappy event at Trentown, that Bowes Read, a brother of governor Read, croſſed the Delaware from Penſylvania, and took, with the preſcribed forms, a Britiſh protection from a Heſſian officer, I believe colonel Donop, at the ſame time

time he requeſted one for his brother the *governor*, which colonel Donop declined giving him, unleſs he ſhould appear in perſon. Soon after Bowes Read acted himſelf in a civil employment in the ſtate of New Jerſey; and the governor, it is well known, as the Marquis obſerves, "publiſhed and exaggerated the offers that were made him by governor Johnſon, and attained his end of playing a leading part in the country." The Marquis ſays that Read is an enemy of Dr. Franklin's. They are worthy rivals. The doctor was equally ſuſpected, in the beginning of the war, in America, as in England; and though there is no doubt but that he was then the ambitious and inveterate enemy of the latter, it would have been difficult to prove it, had any ſiniſter event withered his hopes in their progreſs to maturity. The Tranſlator ſays, "Dr. Franklin, whoſe amiable and philoſophic mind ſincerely laments all the evils attendant on humanity, uſed frequently to regret the particular neceſſity under which he foreſaw America would ſhortly find herſelf, of uſing violence againſt the ſavages, from the bloody ſcenes in which they were led by the policy

of

of the Engliſh government." The marquis de Chaſtellux philoſophiſes in the ſame amiable manner.

I totally deny Dr. Franklin's evidence, that to the policy of the Engliſh government the Indian war is to be attributed; nor is it a novel doctrine that American mercy muſt deſtroy them. Dr. Franklin well knows that the French let looſe "theſe dogs of war" in the year 1756, and that it coſt Great Britain very dear to preſerve the Americans from their fury: the murders committed by the ſavages in violation of a ſacred capitulation, and in ſight of the marquis de Montcalm, have lately been brought to the recollection of the public; and Dr. Franklin was in Philadelphia, when a propoſition was made to a Britiſh officer, from a ſurgeon of that place, to inoculate blankets, and to diſtribute them as preſents to the Indians, to whom that diſorder was fatal. Can the fables of Europe match a ſtory of ſo much baſeneſs and horror? It can find its parallel only in the maſſacre of the Moravian proſelytes, which has been heretofore related, to whom Britiſh faith allowed a neutrality, and American mercy denied

an

an exiſtence. From the nature of the people on the American frontiers, the genius of the Indians, and their recollection of the former perfidies with which the French and American ſettlers accuſe each other, a neutrality is ſcarcely ever to be depended upon.

Dr. Franklin well knows that Congreſs early endeavoured to ſeduce the Indians to war againſt Great Britain. The attempt on Canada was a ſecondary proof of this; and the Tranſlator ſpeaks of a perſon who "was employed by the ſtates of Virginia to conciliate the ſavages, and to obtain their neutrality." "We have been tried and tempted by the Boſtonians," was the anſwer of an old Iroquois chief, to General Burgoyne's ſpeech to the Indians; grateful for the benefits they had received from Great Britain, and dreading the extirpation that attends the marquis de Chaſtellux's philoſophy, all temptations were in vain. General Burgoyne ſufficiently exemplified in his conduct how deſirous the Britiſh government was of reſtraining their ravages.

The Tranſlator ſays, "Serjeant Glyn's character of Mr. Wilkes may with peculiar juſtice be applied to this great man, Dr.

Franklin; few men in whole revolving ages can be found who dare oppoſe themſelves to the force of tyranny, and whoſe ſingle breaſts contain the ſpirit of nations." This great, this eloquent eulogium, if truly applied, reduces the reſt of the Americans to be cyphers, or, what is worſe, the tools of Dr. Franklin. Many doubtleſs were ſo; but the combuſtible materials had long been gathering, not in the oppreſſion of Great Britain, but in the original and republican principles of New England; Dr. Franklin became the incendiary, and, regardleſs of the danger to the community, his malignity led him to ſnatch lightning from heaven* to conſume his perſonal enemies; and if he ſeized the ſceptre from one tyrant, it was to ſhare it with a thouſand.

The Marquis de Chaſtellux relates a long converſation that he had with Mr. Samuel Adams upon the principles of a government,

* A note of the Tranſlator's is,

"Eripuit cœlo fulmen ſceptrumque tyranni."

This verſe is of that virtuous politician and good man Mr. Turgot. The Tranſlator has inſerted it, as it ſeems, by the author's omitting it to be of too high a flavour for French *cenſure*.

of which, the Marquis ſays, Mr. Samuel Adams was the fabricator. The Tranſlator, in a note, ſays the Marquis is miſtaken; and that Mr. John Adams was the author of the conſtitution in queſtion. I have always underſtood that Mr. John Adams, the lawyer, not Mr. Samuel Adams, the malſter, was the author of this conſtitution; and indeed an intercepted letter of the former's, at the beginning of the war, developed his ſcheme, and the ſeverity on which he meant to ſupport it. Yet, the long converſation the Marquis held on the ſubject, and his own ſagacity, make it ſo doubtful, that I can only reconcile the difference by preſuming that Mr. John Adams framed the conſtitution; and that the honourable Mr. Samuel Adams claimed the merit of it with the Marquis, who appears to have been furniſhed with many ſimilar reſpectable informations. The Tranſlator remarks, "it was to this houſe the Marquis de la Fayette retired, to be cured of the firſt wound he received in fighting for America. An accident, which I am well aſſured gave this gallant young nobleman more pleaſure than moſt of our European petit maîtres would

receive

receive from the moſt flattering proofs of the favour of a miſtreſs." The account of the Marquis de la Fayette's wound is what has been generally given, excepting that what the Tranſlator relates as his own obſervation, was part of the original ſtory; to which he has, by his ingenuity, given a more favourable turn. The coquetry, the affected coyneſs, the prudery, with which the Marquis dallied with his admirers, and diſplayed his wound, gave the true idea of a French petit maître to the beholders, and made him the object of ridicule to his fellow-ſoldiers.

Speaking of general Sullivan's expedition againſt the Indians, the Tranſlator remarks, " it may be ſafely aſſerted, that the journal of this expedition would loſe nothing in a compariſon with the famous retreat of the ten thouſand, which it would reſemble very much if we could compare the manœuvres, the object of which is attack, with thoſe which have no other than the preſervation of a forlorn army." Unhappy Greeks, had you been conquered you would have ſuffered leſs diſgrace! Unfortunate Xenophon! your talents, your courage, are ſo miſerably

degraded, that even the mild philoſophy of Socrates would become indignant, could he but know that his illuſtrious diſciple was compared to an attorney of New Hampſhire!

"General Sullivan, after a month's march, arrived without any check at the intrenched camp, the laſt refuge of the ſavages; here he attacked them, and was received with great courage, inſomuch, that the victory would have remained undecided had not the Indians loſt many of their chiefs in battle, which never fails to intimidate them, and retreated during the night. The general deſtroyed their houſes and plantations, ſince which they have never ſhewn themſelves in a body. However inſufficient and ſlight the idea may be that I have given of this campaign, it may nevertheleſs aſtoniſh our European military men to learn, that general Sullivan was only a lawyer in 1775, and that in the year 1780 he quitted the army to reſume his profeſſion, and is now civil governor in New Hampſhire."—European military men, I am apt to believe, will think, that the whole of this expedition ſavours more of the lawyer than of the ſoldier; the

delay

delay of proceſs, minute account of the premiſes, and of the apple-trees, which were enumerated in the American papers as deſtroyed, the indeciſion of the action, and the coſts of ſuit, reminded Congreſs of the general termination of a law-ſuit; for they were to pay the bill.

On the Marquis de Chaſtellux's character of colonel Wadſworth, the Tranſlator's note is, "The Tranſlator cannot forbear adding his teſtimony to this brilliant, but exaggerated eulogium." This ſurely, in Engliſh, muſt mean the Marquis's eulogium is brilliant, but exaggerated; pretty in itſelf, but not true: and this opinion of the Tranſlator I muſt beg leave to transfer to the author's character of Mr. Waſhington. This celebrated man may poſſeſs the foundation of political abilities; for, like other politicians, he is hard-hearted and verſatile. The part he had to act was not a very difficult one; and in the execution of it he was uniformly ſupported by the civil power; they bore the odium of ſeverities, which they could not have executed but for his protection; and he aſſumed the appearance of lenity and forbearance. He had the power

to

to cruſh all rivals, and his jealouſy made him employ it. He was the natural and abſolute diſpoſer of all military preferment; he has been called a Fabius, but by thoſe only who knew the Roman by newſpaper alluſions. The ſyſtem of the one was, at his out-ſet, procraſtination, that of the other offenſive war; and what the Roman adopted from choice, the Virginian was driven into from neceſſity.

The American buzzard ſhould be ſtripped of the eagle's plumage. The nature and ſize of this publication prevent me from a perfect and regular analyſis of his conduct; but I may obſerve, that the credit which our merchants of London gave to the Americans in commerce, all ranks of Engliſhmen extend to them in a political and military line: hence they believe in their profeſſions of virtue, and magnify accidental ſucceſs into uniform ability. Credit degenerates into credulity. No greater inſtance can be given than in the general praiſe ſhowered upon Waſhington for not uſurping the government of America, and overturning the conſtitution of his country. I ſhould not have remarked it, but that this moderation is ſuppoſed

poſed to be the reſult of an uniform conduct, and that it eſtabliſhed the virtuous conſiſtency of his character. I ſhall ſtate a few facts, that will prove he could not have oppoſed his army to the country; and I ſhall publiſh aſſertions that have hitherto been uncontradicted, and obſervations which ſupport them, and deny to Mr. Waſhington the merit of conſiſtency. I have formerly analyſed the American army; and agreed with the Tranſlator of the Marquis de Chaſtellux's Memoirs, that it was an aſſemblage of all nations. Had it been an army of natives, it would have been an army of agitators; and a real Cromwel would have ſnatched the ſword of empire from an imaginary one*: but neither Congreſs nor Waſhington could have led this heterogeneous army againſt any one ſtate; it would have mouldered away on its march, and periſhed in the onſet. I believe Mr. John Adams to have ſeen as far as any man in Europe or America; his original object was to eſtabliſh a

* I will not degrade the virtues and military talents of Fairfax by comparing him to Waſhington, the reſemblance would be much the ſame as between Xenophon and Sullivan.

republic; and he never loſt ſight of it. To conceal their intentions, to deny, and to diſavow, "fallere & effugere" (which has been ſo often and ſo well applied to American armies), were the means by which the Congreſs paved their way to ſucceſs: independency was the point at which Mr. Adams aimed; this was the goal, where he expected to triumph. At the commencement of the war, when England was in hourly expectation of amicable accommodation, and Congreſs dreaded that a ſkirmiſh might be deciſive, this able man then declared, "we can fight Great Britain for five years with her own weapons" (meaning European emigrants), "and it is ſtrange if, during that period, ſome fortunate event does not happen in Europe to befriend us." He did foreſee this, and he might conjecture, that he ſhould become an ambaſſador to the court of Great Britain; but it was beyond his foreſight, that America probably owes her ſafety to the compoſition of her army, to her defenders being aliens, and not natives; in either caſe, Mr. Waſhington, as the leader of it, was not to be dreaded.

I bear

I bear no reſentment to that general; his virtues and his vices are now out of the queſtion; and whether he continues a land-jobber in Virginia, or the preſident of Congreſs, is totally indifferent. The expoſition of truth is all my deſign. Succeſs animates a mercenary army; Mr. Waſhington had no hold on this chain of union. The capture of Lord Cornwallis's army was the effect of joint operation and French artillery. The ſurprize of Waſhington at Brandywine, and defeat at German Town, have not added to his reputation; and the terming his repulſe at Monmouth a defeat of the Britiſh army, proved, that having aſſumed French politics, he was intoxicated with their manners. The Congreſs called it a victory, the army knew the term to be a "diſhonourable gaſconade." Soldiers draw their concluſions, not from gazettes which they hear, but from operations to which they contribute.

The army having little reaſon to rely on the abilities of the general, we ſhall now ſee what right it had to confide in the military talents of thoſe ſecondary perſons, the intermediate links between the com-

mander in chief and the army, the general officers, whom Mr. Washington trusted and employed. M. Fayette, whom I again call, in the Marquis de Chastellux's terms, "a Gascon as well as the rest of them," was distinguished in every American Gazette by name *, and no where by action. General Wayne, indefatigable, active, and brave, had made some amends, by his taking of Stoney Point, for having himself been circumvented by sir Charles Grey in a situation most disgraceful to a soldier, that of being surprised by an army, whose motions he was sent to observe; if he

* The Marquis de la Fayette's claim to any military reputation I absolutely deny; that he was a man of political consequence cannot be disputed; nor can there be a better idea of it than in what the Marquis de Chastellux asserts, "That private letters from him have frequently produced more effect on some states than the strongest exhortations from the Congress;" but this remark lessens our idea of American union. Congress must have wanted principle in their exhortations, or patriotism in the separate states by no means been universal. M. Fayette's aiming to command an enterprize that Schuyler had projected against Canada, as the M. de Chastellux relates, it does him no credit, and disgraces Washington; Schuyler was too cunning for both.

should,

ſhould ever read my account of the Marquis de la Fayette, he will enjoy it, and ſay it is true. Mifflen and Lee were driven from the army they had often ſaved. M. de Chaſtellux heard Mifflen harangue in the ſenate; and, from his deſcription, it was with that ſame ſuperiority and imperatorial dignity which, in the greateſt emergencies, he dictated to general Waſhington the means of his preſervation. As an American ſoldier, Lee was the moſt injured man in the univerſe; as an Engliſhman, he profeſſed to fight on the ſame principles which made ſo beautiful a figure in the ſpeeches of the Britiſh parliament. The generals Sullivan and Stirling often invaded the iſlands in the poſſeſſion of the Britiſh: their firſt impriſonment always made them attentive to ſecure a retreat, and they retreated "bootleſs, weather-beaten," and diſgraced. General Gates, the nominal conqueror of general Burgoyne, laid laurels, not his own, at lord Cornwallis's feet. He is no hypocrite, but real in his love for liberty; and if Waſhington, as the Tranſlator hints, replaced him in his confidence, it was not while he was an object of envy.

M. de Chaſtellux mentions nothing of general Green; his Tranſlator ſpeaks of the "unabated courage of that great officer, general Green:" his courage was certainly unabated, and in this conſiſted his only greatneſs; he flew from defeat to defeat; he ſhrunk from the correction of lord Rawdon as a ſchool-boy would from his maſter; and the cannon, which he ſaved at Cambden, by fortunately hiding them, he loſt when he injudiciouſly expoſed them at Entaw Springs. I mean not to depreciate the American generals: the art of war is a ſcience; it requires ſtudy; and a Britiſh officer, who has been any time in the army, is diſgraced, if not ſuppoſed to be ſuperior to thoſe who have not made it their profeſſion *: if he is not

* It may be ſaid that genius will far outſtrip application; that a civil war is its proper ſoil; and therefore that the American generals may have been more capable of leading armies than the Britiſh officers, who have riſen to command by rotation. I believe civil war changes the courſe of ability, but adds not to its quantity; an uniform dereliction of conſcience is the great ſtep to eminence in ſo dreadful a conteſt. Political men, without any peculiar military talents or inclinations, may embrace the profeſſion of arms, as that which experience teaches us has ultimately arrived

not ſo, it is a ſerious misfortune to his country.

From theſe facts it appears Mr. Waſhington had no influence in his army, deducible from his own perſonal ſucceſs, or thoſe of his generals whom he principally employed *. The greateſt conqueſt the Americans

rived at the ſummit of power. The ſeparate ſtates of America ſeem to have truſted the command of their armies to their citizens, and not to have ſought for ſoldiers; ſuppoſing that they had acted otherwiſe, in the late American war, ſo extenſive in its operations, and forming a period,

" When all the youth of England were on fire;"

it was natural to preſume that cultivated military genius among the Britiſh army might find its way to command; and it did ſo: my account of general Green is ſtrictly true; he was the choſen general of the American army, and he muſt have drawn conſolation from the very ſingular talents, both as a ſoldier and a ſtateſman, that intereſt this country in the life of lord Rawdon.

* The Tranſlator mentions " Montgomery's monument and fame, as a victim to tyranny, and a champion of freedom, conſigned to be celebrated by an enſlaved people, againſt whom he had often fought in defence of the ſame cauſe in which he ſacrificed his life." This paragraph is curious enough from an avowed partizan of France. Montgomery was neither diſtinguiſhed by high rank, or eminent for abilities; his

cans gained was over general Burgoyne; whoſe valour, military abilities, bright endowments, the utmoſt confidence of his troops, and thoſe ſecond to none in the univerſe; the ſcience of Philips, and the courage of Frazer, were unavailing againſt the natural obſtacles of the country, and the numbers of the native Americans. His failure of ſucceſs is an irrefragable proof that Waſhington could not become the tyrant of his country; and that, if we praiſe the prudence of his head, we have no right to infer from moderation in this reſpect, the virtues of his heart; much leſs to draw deductions from it in ſupport of the principles of his former conduct.

The Tranſlator mentions a ſtrong party,

his adoption of the American cauſe ſupplied both, and he was raiſed to ſuch reputation as parliamentary oratory could beſtow, by his countrymen, Mr. Edmund Burke, and colonel Barre. Their encomiums are but words; he was neither a Wolfe, nor a Hampden; and the enſlaved people of France may celebrate him as a hero. General Carleton, now lord Dorcheſter, who had been inſulted by Montgomery, and in the American idiom, for ſuch is, "by Heavens I will ſhew you no mercy," nobly avenged himſelf, by giving his body a ſoldier's funeral.

" who affected to hold Mr. Waſhington in no high reſpect." When M. de Chaſtellux ſpeaks of the propriety of erecting ſtatues to Waſhington, the Tranſlator praiſes " the wiſdom of Congreſs in not erecting a ſtatue to him during his-life time." And he adds, that the Marquis would be ſatisfied with their reaſons, if he knew them. The Tranſlator ſays, " Reflection might have convinced Mr. Bracknel, who hung up Cromwell's head as his ſign, that, in the actual poſition of America, there was more to be apprehended from a Cromwell than a Charles." And adds, " that nothing could have made him replace Cromwell but the Britiſh having thrown him down." Circumſtances like theſe detract from the eulogiums that the Marquis de Chaſtellux and other flatterers pour upon Mr. Waſhington; it has been aſſerted that Mr. Waſhington was flattered into his command; that this was the method by which New England policy animated the ſupineneſs of Virginia, and led it into action; and it has been ſaid, and never contradicted, that Mr. Waſhington frequently and repeatedly declared that he never would conſent to independency; if it

be

be ſo, the reader probably will agree with me, that Mr. Waſhington is not a conſiſtent character: that he is ſuſpected in America; and he will think with the Tranſlator, "that Congreſs are wiſe in not erecting a ſtatue in his life-time to that general."

The order of Cincinnati, which has been ſuppoſed the offspring of political deſign, appears to me a natural bond of union between thoſe whom accident had called together, ſimilar fortunes endeared, and whom peace has again diſſevered: incapable of effecting any ambitious views, commentators have amplified it into conſequence; it certainly is more calculated to awaken the talents of the orator than the fears of the politician. Futurity is haſtening to produce new revolutions, and conqueſt will be checked only by the boundaries of nature, not the diviſions of geometry. Then the chimeras of democracy will be done away, and riches, as M. de Chaſtellux obſerves of the ladies of Philadelphia, will eſtabliſh their natural precedency; they will combine with arms to acquire, and tranſmit hereditary honours. Tyranny may inſtantaneouſly form an iron bond of union, and preſerve its force during the

the unnatural ſtate of warfare; but laws and proviſions, neceſſary to ſecure the multifarious intereſts of a peaceful people, and to diffuſe and render permanent thoſe bleſſings which, as Monteſquieu affirms, England knows beſt how to uſe and to enjoy, "the bleſſings of religion, liberty, and commerce," muſt be the reſult, not of ſpeculation, but of practice; of the wiſdom of ages, not of the reſolves of a moment. Whenever I read of the American laws, of ſome being adapted to the infantine ſtate of ſociety, others to a maturer age, and many negligently looking forward to poſterity, I ſincerely lament the condition of the poor people, and apply to them what the Tranſlator remarks when M. de Chaſtellux talks of the French adopting our manner of gardening, "the gardens I have hitherto ſeen in [America] France, profeſſedly laid out on the Engliſh model, are, with great deference to the authors, very unſucceſsful imitations of the Engliſh ſtyle." The reader may purſue the metaphor, and he will find, windmills, Chineſe bridges, and cockle-ſhell temples, to illuſtrate the creation of theſe ſyſtem-mongers.

From the Tranſlator we gather, that general Arnold received ſeven thouſand pounds in the funds; and from the Author, that he was to deliver up Weſt Point. The death of major André is univerſally known; and the rank that he bore of adjutant-general in the Britiſh army. From theſe inferences, admitting their truth, what deductions can we draw? Could Arnold alone give up Weſt Point? Would an adjutant-general have viſited him for what he alone could have accompliſhed? Would he have been hazarded for the completion of ſo ſmall an object? Is there nothing in Arnold's aſſeverations? Gave he no reaſons for his conduct? He did. Much of this extraordinary event will doubtleſs be ever concealed; and probably little more than what has already tranſpired will be known to the preſent generation. Arnold's aſſertions, that America in general was ſatisfied with the offers of the Britiſh nation, that it was averſe to the French, and the continuation of the war, were true. It has been before obſerved, that Waſhington aſſerted, that he would never agree to independency; and though the Congreſs decreed that all their votes

votes ſhould be ſtyled unanimous, it is well known that more than once a ſingle voice or two has decided upon their moſt important reſolutions. To a certain length Galloway acceded to the American cauſe, and in England, people at different periods deſiſted from their ſupport of America as ſhe receded from her connections with this country; this did the great and wiſe earl of Chatham, the firſt ſtateſman of the age.

The argument is not whether this change of ſentiments proceeded from patriotic principles, or ſiniſter paſſions; it is the fact that I inſiſt upon. In our own civil wars, Hyde and Eſſex, Falkland and Whitlock, and many others, furniſhed the precedent; and this conduct muſt ariſe from the nature of man, imperfect in himſelf, his judgments, and opinions; and actuated from events and effects originating from ſo imperfect a ſource. Was it not ſo, how could a war ever be terminated? A brave, but a divided people, under the influence of conſcience, and a firm belief of the juſtice of their cauſe, would fight to their mutual deſtruction, "and darkneſs be the burier of the dead." Hiſtory, when it points out to us the cala-

mities of civil wars, uniformly delineates their termination, not ſo much in the deſtruction of mankind, as in their change of opinions. Had Lambert eſcaped from his purſuers, and the army revolted from Monk, what would have been Monk's fate? And in what light would poſterity conſider his memory? A republican, and therefore unconſtitutional party, at preſent detract from his reputation; but he is venerated by Engliſhmen in general, as the reſtorer of the peace of his country. That general has been blamed for permitting the reſtoration of the king without compact: the time neceſſary for making ſuch a *free*, *general*, and *Engliſh compact*, would have ruined his meaſures; ſecreſy alone could give ſucceſs to his arduous undertaking. He truſted, and he truſted juſtly, that the ſpirit of the times would ſecure the liberty of the ſubject, againſt which it was viſible the crown muſt contend in vain. Clarendon had wiſdom ſufficient to diſtinguiſh the momentary acclamations of all ranks of people, happy in the termination of their individual miſeries, from the ſober and collective voice of their judgment. If the houſe of Stuart, on the removal

moval of that great man, forgot their own intereſts, and ungratefully invaded the liberties of the people, it certainly was contrary to the calculations of reaſon, and they loſt the crown in conſequence; the ſpirit of the people, as one man, roſe up againſt them, and let it be remembered, the Revolution was effected without bloodſhed. Had Arnold, and thoſe who thought with him, given a ſevere blow, and without bloodſhed, to Waſhington's army; had he broke the civil chains of the people, and reſtored the ſword to their hands, had they accepted the more than independency which was offered to America by Great Britain; and had the empire by theſe means been reſtored to union, who would have enjoyed the bleſſings of this age, and been the favourite of poſterity, the active, enterpriſing American Arnold, or the cool, deſigning, frenchified Waſhington? Theſe terms are derived from the Marquis's Memoirs; his opinions, and the rejoicings of the Americans upon the failure of Arnold's attempt, eſtabliſh its magnitude.

The Marquis de Chaſtellux obſerves, "I cannot help admiring the addreſs with which

Mr.

Mr. Barkminſter, a young miniſter, introduced politics into his ſermons." I will not even quote the paſſage, it is offence to a Chriſtian ear. Nor is the Tranſlator's account much better, that the prevalent religion of the principal inhabitants of America, and particularly to the Southward, is pure Deiſm. I ſhall only remark, that the moſt ſtupendous event which has hitherto been produced by the American revolution, is the introduction of Epiſcopacy; an end oppoſite, very oppoſite indeed, to the intentions and expectancy of thoſe who, in Europe and America, were among the promoters of its independency, and totally contrary to the politics of the fanatic and the ſelf-ſufficiency of the Deiſt.

As a general obſervation, though frequently applicable to the Author of theſe Travels, and univerſally to the Tranſlator of them, I ſhall remark the variety of abuſe that has been thrown upon Britiſh generals, and the Britiſh armies *. Eloquence has

* The Marquis is proud to celebrate the dancing of his countrymen; and the Tranſlator relates, with great complacency, a dance at Alexandria, attended with

has been employed to blacken their reputation; poetry has attempted to embelliſh the unjuſt fictions of party with the luſtre of truth; the Engliſh garden has been disfigured by miſplaced ornaments, and polluted by temples unneceſſarily erected to America. Such calumnies the Britiſh generals may look down upon with magnanimous diſdain; they know that war has its unavoidable miſeries, they know that Boſton, Philadelphia, Newport, and Charles Town, acquit them of unneceſſary deſtruction. Careleſſneſs in a ſingle centinel, or deſign in any injured, irritated, and exiled Loyaliſt, would have reduced either of thoſe capitals to aſhes;

with circumſtances that Europeans will think indecent in the French officers to ſuffer; but he terms the Meſchianza, which was conducted with magnificence, elegance, and decorum, "An illuſtrious act of folly and infatuation." What one military operation could this noble entertainment prevent? or what expence fell upon the public? It was the tribute of affection from the field-officers of an army to a general they revered, on the eve of his departure for Europe, and when he could no longer ſerve them. This diſintereſted gratitude, in the purity of American principles, the Tranſlator calls an illuſtrious act of folly; and in his eyes the judgment that an army forms of its general, is infatuation.

this, their orders, and the vigilant and faithful execution of them effectually prevented. New York too, amidſt her ruins, will remind poſterity to whoſe exertion it owes what remains of it; the Guards of the king of Great Britain having preſerved what a cowardly enemy had devoted to the flames. But while there can be no doubt but that theſe generals may rely upon the teſtimony of their hearts for the propriety of their conduct, and that a future age will do their memory ample juſtice, the ſubordinate officer, whoſe ſtation will not procure him admiſſion to the auguſt tribunal of poſterity, ſuffers the taunts and ignominy which ariſe from groundleſs calumny, and the effrontery of falſehood. He expects an enemy in a French officer; nor does he wiſh for an advocate in a ſubject of the United States; but he has a right to demand, that Britons will receive no imputations that injure national or individual reputation, without the fulleſt proofs; they will then only be juſt to their own intereſt, for though in other profeſſions the venality of politics, and the frequency of anonymous abuſe, has almoſt introduced an indifference to all aſperſions; in the ſoldier

dier the deſtruction of private ſenſibility is an injury to national honour; for whatever blunts the one, detracts from that ſum which conſtitutes the value of the other.

Mr. Payne, an Engliſh emigrant, and ſuch perſons as the Tranſlator, may calculate as they pleaſe, may elevate the power of America, and degrade that of Europe; they may endue infancy with ſtrength and animation, and reduce the vigour of youth to decrepitude. Such repreſentations will have no effect. The Tranſlator, if a native of Great Britain, will be deſpiſed at home, and meet with that neglect from America which has uniformly attended his countrymen, when they could no longer injure Great Britain. The potency of Mr. Payne's affirmations, the ſpells of his language, were ſucceſsful in diſturbing the peace of ſociety, and in injuring the country from whence he drew his unhallowed birth; peace has at once diſperſed his incantations. He, probably, curſes the hour in which Dr. Franklin ſummoned him from his country; allured him acroſs the Atlantic, and compacted with him to ſell his talents for the moſt miſchievous purpoſes. Let us leave him to

the contempt which he has long met with from the inhabitants of Philadelphia, and the upbraidings of his own conſcience.

But I muſt confeſs I am inclined to believe the Marquis de Chaſtellux's character of Mr. Jefferſon. The very inclination is reſpect. There is an uniformity throughout, that appears to me to be natural; and the Author in this delineation has at leaſt the merit of conſiſtency. I have no poſitive teſtimony to contradict what is aſſerted of his talents and virtues, and I reſpect mankind too much to be ſollicitous in my ſearch of a negative; to him therefore, and to men of ſimilar deſcription, theſe concluding animadverſions are addreſſed; my heart neither dictates them through malignity, nor doth my hand ſubſcribe them through apprehenſion; if they come not from a friend to America, they proceed not from an enemy; and in either caſe their intrinſic merit muſt decide upon their reception. The Tranſlator remarks, "Mr. Jefferſon, a man of profound thought, and of great penetration, is of opinion, that emigrants from Europe are not deſirable; leſt the emigrants bringing with them, not only the vices, but the

corrupt

corrupt prejudices of their reſpective ancient governments, may be unable to reliſh that bold univerſal ſyſtem of freedom and toleration which is a novelty to the old world." This opinion the Tranſlator controverts.

Mr. Jefferſon well knows that no emigrant comes to diſpute the laws of the country to which he wanders, but to ſubmit to them; not to diſplay his own wiſdom, but to be benefited by that of others. For Engliſhmen it is a ſublimer, and more natural hope, to amend the defects of their own laws than to ſeek refuge from them in the wilds of America; the field of Naſeby, and the Revolution bear witneſs to it; events to which we owe the bleſſings we now enjoy, and are thankful for; and which, in all human probability, will ſecure Britiſh freedom for ages, amidſt the wrecks of arbitrary republics, and abſolute monarchies.

The Tranſlator furniſhes me with another obſervation, which will produce the concluſion I mean to draw, and I believe the reader will think it explanatory of Mr. Jefferſon's *real reaſons* for wiſhing to prevent emigrations to America: what have been given I eſteem as merely *oſtenſible* ones. "It

is from the interior ſettlements of this vaſt country that America will derive her future greatneſs, and eſtabliſh new empires to rival, and perhaps outdo, the ancient world." It is the jealouſy of theſe new empires, Mr. Jefferſon, that prevents you from the encouragement of emigrants. For whither will they reſort to? Not to the old colonies, but to the new poſſeſſions; not to ſickly climates, but to thoſe which are as healthy as any in the world; not to where they will become ſervants, but where they may enjoy equality: your ſlaves, the very negroes, will participate the benefits of theſe new ſettlements; and what to you, Sir, humanity poſſibly may dictate, ſelf-intereſt will reluctantly compel others to follow; a milder treatment of theſe unfortunate men, to prevent their flight and emancipation. Your Congreſs muſt admit theſe ſettlements into a federal union, when they acquire power to claim independency; it muſt aſſume the graces of benevolence from the compulſion of ſelf-intereſt, and diveſting neceſſity of her iron habiliments, array her in all the decorations of juſtice.

Virginia may abandon the luxuries of Europe;

rope; but Europe is elegant as well as luxurious: her embelliſhments have an intrinſic merit to attract the eyes of the ignorant, and the judgment of the polite. Habit alone, without the national character which M. de Chaſtellux attributes to the Virginians, has made them neceſſary to you. You will ſoon become an object of envy to thoſe who do not poſſeſs your ſplendour; theſe riſing empires, theſe interior emigrants, when they obſerve your enjoyments, and your natural oſtentation will diſplay them, they will regret their own ſituation, and, as it is natural for the human mind, they will ſeek for conſolation in a compariſon of their own advantages, and they will find it in the enjoyment of ſuperior force. Having once reaſoned themſelves into a knowledge of their own ſuperiority, it will only remain to prove it upon you. Europe, in its nations the moſt diſtant from each other, has not an example where man is ſo different in himſelf, as in the enervated inhabitant of Virginia and Carolina, and his vigorous neighbour of the back-ſettlements and Kentuck: employment adds to the force of climate, in rendering the difference permanent; the one is a

country of merchants and artizans, ſubject to emigrations; the other of peaſantry, like the ancient Romans, *adjuncti gleba*, on the beſt motives, they are the owners of it. Such, Sir, being the weakneſs of your native colony: ſuch, in reſpect to other riſing empires, being the ſituation of moſt of the ſtates of your confederacy; talk not of naval force, of combined fleets, and future hoſtilities; adopt a ſyſtem of government uſeful to your own ſubjects, and be at peace with the world. Away with ſuch ſentiments as your's, "that Providence has placed the richeſt poſſeſſions of Europe at our door, and has obliged their moſt precious commerce to paſs as it were in review before us *:" they convey *piratical* ideas; and ſuch as I am perſuaded are foreign to your meaning. At this time they are particularly unſeaſonable; mankind has a right to be jealous, not of the power of Congreſs, but of its perſonal weakneſs †; reaſon and experience

* The Tranſlator quotes this paſſage from a work of Mr. Jefferſon's.

† One of Mr. Payne's humane diſcoveries to promote American independence was, "The diminution of

perience convince us that ſtateſmen who have been eminent, and are fallen into neglect, will endeavour to regain their power by the ſame means which produced it; and will practiſe what the theoriſt preſcribes to kingdoms in a ſtate of decay, the recurring to firſt principles for the renovation of their conſtitution and pre-eminence. In the opinion of Congreſs, war may reſtore its conſequence; its preſent weakneſs is evident in its not fulfilling the treaty of peace, which ſhould not be attributed to want of faith, but to the want of power.

There is in general but one ſentiment relative to America throughout Great Britain; ſhe regrets only her national debt, and not the loſs of her colonies. Some are not wanting to ſay that even that debt is cheaply purchaſed, if Great Britain is wiſe enough to attend to her internal advantages, and to prefer the certainty of their cultivation to all foreign and precarious emoluments. The moſt determined enemies of American independence are not ſo to the

of trade affords an army, and the neceſſities of an army create a new trade." May it never again be applicable!

United

United States. Perſonal diſlike to the governors is loſt in general compaſſion for their ſubjects, and the ſole object of the inhabitants of Great Britain is the preſervation of peace.

Argument ſhould be combated with argument. If you appeal to the ſword, it is neceſſary you ſhould meaſure that of your adverſary; and that you ſhould inform yourſelf of his force, whenever you produce your own. "England, you ſay, muſt act by detachment." England could act by detachment; not only naval, which you allow, but military, which you have forgotten. The force which conquered the Havannah would be fully ſufficient to reduce any one of the United States to think peace, on the moſt unconditional terms, deſireable. And this might be eaſily effected by the introduction of the mildeſt methods of European warfare, which every military author directs, and every general practiſes, by burning the houſes of ſuch peaſants as take up arms without being regimented; levying contributions upon towns to ſave them from plunder; and living upon the country. What conſolation would

it

it be to ſuch a country, that it is preſerved from abſolute territorial conqueſt, which Great Britain is too wiſe to aim at, by belonging to an impotent confederation. The eſtabliſhment of your independency was not the reſult of American talents, or American courage. It is to be attributed to Britiſh credulity, and Britiſh diſunion; and, finally, as the Marquis de Chaſtellux obſerves, to the aſſiſtance of France. Having juſt hinted that England might be an active and fatal enemy, if any ſiniſter paſſion ſhould lead Congreſs to quarrel with her, I ſhall ſtate to you ſome moral and political reaſons, that ſhould make you prefer her alliance; and emancipate yourſelves from the power of France. The ſacred war has ceaſed; thank Philip, but let him preſide not in the council of the Amphictyons.

The late war originated from error, not deſign; from events which, though futurity may regret, the preſent age did not occaſion. The glorious Revolution, in fact, annihilated the ſource from whence the chartered governments of America deduced their origin, without the proper ſubſtitution of power that might connect and incorporate the empire. It was not then foreſeen

that America, in her weak ſituation, would ſilently accord with the principles of the Revolution, to which when ſhe grew into ſtrength ſhe would refuſe obedience; that ſhe would claim her rights under the ſanction of kingly government, which was annihilated, and refuſe the obedience which Great Britain yielded to the ſupremacy of king and parliament*. The very effects deducible from theſe cauſes were perverted, and the principle of no man's being taxed without repreſentation, which could flow only from the government of king and parliament, was inſiſted upon by thoſe who refuſed obedience to king and parliament, and who deduced their privileges from royal charters, where no ſuch principles are to be found. Many, who viewed the circle of government on its wideſt range, thought

* Read the Marquis de Chaſtellux's converſation with governor Trumbull, and the account of New England, in 1670, declining to apply to the Engliſh parliament, as the Marquis obſerves, "early proving that they never acknowledged the authority of parliament." It is ſcarce neceſſary to obſerve, that had this doctrine been *earlier* divulged, the Engliſh parliament would not have ſubmitted to a co-ordinate power in its colonies; nor would they have been juſtified in ſpending the treaſure of their conſtituents in their defence.

that

that it was abſolutely neceſſary for the ſafety and connection of the empire, that ſovereignty ſhould reſide ſomewhere, and that its proper ſtation was in the Britiſh parliament: others contended that the colonies were too great for ſuch an obedience, and that the ſyſtem of government ſhould be accommodated to their preſent ſituation. Theſe various reaſons had an *honourable* influence on the minds of thinking men. Faction aſſiduouſly moulded the tempers and various intereſts of others to her *baſer* purpoſes. She pervaded England, mixed in her moſt ſerious councils, and rendered all her operations inconſiſtent and ineffectual. But no political controverſy or ſpeculative opinion could have had ſo prodigious an effect, had not the paſſions of the people of America been inflamed, or their ſelf-intereſt been injured; and this was the caſe in the northern colonies, where the war firſt commenced: the attempt to ſuppreſs illegal commerce ſoured the numbers who were benefited by it on the ſea-coaſt; and fanaticiſm, dreſſed in the garb of religion, became the medium of politics in the receſſes of New England, and infuſed itſelf into the hearts of its inhabitants; they firmly be-

lieved that " the end of New England's coming was religion *," bore a hoſtile hatred to the eſtabliſhment that protected a different church-government, and ſaw the time was arrived in which they had the proſpect of involving it in ruins.

To the ſouthward, ſupine and indolent were your exertions; " an enlightened few only" leagued themſelves with the northern colonies, with people whom they deſpiſed as hypocrites in religion, and as atheiſts in morality. The diſpute in Virginia, as the Marquis obſerves, " aroſe from a different nature;" and if the people of South Carolina ſhewed at any time any exertion, it was only the inhabitants of the back-country; and they were allured by the hopes of plundering the Loyaliſts; they flew to arms, and Ferguſon fell a victim to people whoſe exiſtence is ſcarcely known to yourſelves. I have given this detail, to prove, in the firſt inſtance, that the ſuppoſed origin † of the quarrel was ſuch as, on the beſt principles, Great Britain and America might ſtedfaſtly

* Expreſſions in the famous fanatical compoſition of Elijah's Mantle, univerſally credited among the interior parts of New England.

† Read the Marquis de Chaſtellux's account of his interview with Mr. Harriſon.

ſupport;

ſupport; that it was natural for them mutually to appeal to the ſword; and that the ſword being ſheathed, ſuch errors ought to be mutually forgiven. I alſo offer it, ſecondarily, as a memento to the inhabitants of the ſouthern ſtates, who know ſucceſs has rather confirmed than altered the fanaticiſm* of New England; that the doctrines of Elijah's Mantle are conſidered by them as prophecies, and that "the rolling ſtone which is to *overturn*†, *overturn*, *overturn*, all nations," in its firſt bounds, will paſs the Delaware and the Cheſapeak, before it acquires the momentum to leap acroſs the Atlantic.

Place us in the ſituation we were in 1763, ſays Congreſs, and America will be ſatisfied: was this ſpeech made in earneſt? was it juſt? was it the language of that Congreſs which was "compoſed of every wiſe man in America," as the Marquis de Chaſtellux obſerves? was it true? It was. Truth is immutable — the acceſſaries, the calamities,

* The Tranſlator informs us, that lately at Boſton the propoſal for the Sabbath's conſiſting of ſix and thirty hours paſſed the aſſembly where the country intereſt prevailed, and was thrown out by the merchants who predominated in the ſenate.

† From Elijah's Mantle.

that

that war has brought with it may obſcure its luſtre, but cannot alter its nature; a revolution may affect your form of government, but cannot change the ſubſtance of your intereſt. The naval power of Great Britain has the advantage of increaſing in the hour of peace. When the reſt of mankind are in profound repoſe, the ſeamen, who are to fight our future battles, are diſciplined by the dangers they have to combat, and the elements they muſt overcome; the Navigation Act, that ſacred Palladium, which our anceſtors have delivered to us, we will piouſly tranſmit to our children. You ſpeak of creating a navy; it will impoveriſh you: it includes arſenals to eſtabliſh, and fortifications and troops to protect it. A ſource of expence, which, in your ſtate of infancy, will be inſupportable, and which nothing but an unjuſt jealouſy of Great Britain, or a worſe principle, can make neceſſary. Our national gratitude, our honour is pledged to France, ſays the American. On what principle did France aſſiſt you? Avowedly on that of its own intereſt. The object being fulfilled, the contract is no more. If you make a commercial treaty, contrary to your own intereſt,

eſt, to ſerve France, ſhe certainly will ſay you are her friend; but Europe will call you her tributary. Your enmity to England is unnatural; no rational man will allow that reſentment is a proper guide in the paths of public virtue, or political wiſdom; if private paſſions, and effects which exiſt beyond their cauſes, are to regulate the proceedings of your government, miſerable indeed will the people of America be! They will have ſacrificed the ſubſtance, without a ſight of the ſhadow; and that hour will doubly be accurſed, in which Pandora's box was opened in the New World, if Hope remains not behind!

Having analyzed the principles which ſet Great Britain and her Colonies at variance; having ſtated the well-known views of ſelf-intereſt that led France to aſſiſt America; I ſhall add, that Corſica at this moment is a bleeding witneſs of French politics; that her wars have always been the wars of ambition; and that no ſophiſtry can diminiſh or obliterate the hiſtorical truth, that Great Britain has ſolely undertaken them to preſerve the balance of power, and conſequent liberties, of Europe, againſt the encroachments of France. The gradual ſubſiding

of deſpotiſm into a milder ſway, the humane adminiſtration of laws, which now pervades the world, originate more from example than precept; more from the obſervance of the advantages with which freedom has enriched England, than any incidental liberality in the governors of mankind. The utility of France, as an ally, depends upon circumſtances that probably will never happen; to ſecure you to her intereſts ſhe will alarm your fears, by pointing out Canada as connecting the inhabitants of the back-countries, and uniting nations againſt you: or, to allure your avarice, ſhe will deſcribe her as rich; and, with the Tranſlator of M. de Chaſtellux's Travels, eaſy of conqueſt: ſhe may ſhew you the Weſt India iſlands as dependant upon you; and hint, that Mexico is at no great diſtance. Theſe are views of general policy, and are not applicable to the preſent moment of univerſal peace. When the will of arbitrary princes, or the paſſions of republican governors, ſuſpend not the real advantages of their ſubjects, the concluſion of what treaty is beneficial to them will be drawn from the numbers who can be employed, and benefited by a commercial intercourſe with other nations,

and

and from the compariſon of the reſpective utility which the individuals of one country can be of to another; and in this preſent inſtance it is to be weighed, whether a connexion with Great Britain or France is moſt profitable to the Americans? Every community which nature, habit, intereſt, policy, and language produce, aſſimilates him with the Briton, and preſſes upon him an averſion to the ſubject of France.

There never was a kingdom, or even a republic, Mr. Jefferſon, in which the ſubject enjoys ſo much individual freedom as in Great Britain. The French, on the contrary, are in abſolute ſlavery; their chains are gilded, and they wear them as ornaments; the more they are individually known, the leſs will they be nationally reſpected*: if you admit not of emigrants amongſt you, Mr. Jefferſon, "leſt they ſhould be unable to reliſh your bold ſyſtem

* What the ſhrewd Jeſuit Charlevoix ſays of the French and Indians, may literally be applied to the French and the Americans, "L'expérience, non pas dedit ans, mais de plus d'un ſiécle nous a appris que le plus mauvais ſyſtéme pour bien gouverner ces peuples, & pour les maintenir dans nos intérêts, étoit de les approcher des François; qu'ils auroient beaucoup plus eſtimés, s'ils les avoient moins vûs de près."

of freedom and toleration;" permit not your ſubjects to enter into too cloſe connection with thoſe who have neither freedom nor toleration; and who, however profuſe they may be of their Utopian ideas to diſturb the peace and welfare of the reſt of mankind, ſhrink from the very recital of any political matters that relate to their own government. Engliſhmen, on the contrary, will tell you, that the bold ſyſtem you ſpeak of, has for years been in their poſſeſſion; and that your preſent greatneſs is a proof of it. They will do more, they will ſincerely wiſh you long to preſerve your freedom; they have an intereſt in it; Holland and Switzerland are not to be named; they are, in fact, the tributaries of France, and where elſe is liberty to be found?

"Idque etiam adverſus Britannos profuturum, ſi Romana ubique arma, & velut e conſpectu Libertas tolleratur," was a principle on which the Roman governor of England meant to ſubdue Ireland; policy therefore makes an intercourſe with the ſubjects of Great Britain and America of mutual advantage, to inculcate and preſerve the principles of their mutual freedom. There are ſtronger reaſons than ſpecula-

tions,

tions, which, originating from the paſt, look forward to futurity: preſent intereſt, and commercial advantages, theſe allure you to renew your intercourſe with that country. A wonderful event is now taking place, a treaty of commerce between England and France! Light is about to ſpring from a chaos of politics; and national amity from the violence of national reſentment: this is an effect that none of the ſons of men could have expected to attend the termination of the late war. Engliſhmen may ſafely aſk, if France and England forget the injuries which for ages they have received from each other? Shall America retain her reſentment, the reſentment of a day? It is the duty of men, Sir, who are in your ſituation, to allay this reſentment; a moiety of the abilities which have been employed to ſeparate America and Great Britain, will reſtore them to a beneficial union; and poſterity, which at a glance can trace the cauſes and effects of the preſent age, will conſecrate him who ſhall be inſtrumental therein, among the benefactors of mankind.

The preſent moment is big with important events. Commerce is breaking the

bonds of monopoly, and pervading all nations; when infinitely ſubdivided and diffuſed, like the elements, ſhe is an univerſal bleſſing; but if, by the puny artifice of men, or by ſome hidden operation in nature, ſhe is pent up, and collected in one ſtation, her expanſions are dreadful! They have ruined republics and empires, and produced as many calamities in the moral world, as inundations, earthquakes, and volcanoes have to the natural one. Commerce ſhrinks from the ſight of arbitrary power: that which is the buſineſs of all men, will not be confined by the will of one; and that country will enjoy the greateſt ſhare of her favours, and act upon her trueſt principles, where there is equal juſtice and common freedom: this country is Great Britain. To what a wonderful eminence have their merchants arrived! From your youth, Mr. Jefferſon, you muſt have heard of their greatneſs, and in all probability been benefited by its effects!

A memorable and well known expreſſion of the unfortunate king John of France was, "If good faith ſhould be baniſhed from the reſt of mankind, it ought to find harbour in the hearts of kings." The idea is ſublime,

and

and the ſaying truly royal! It is at this moment exemplified by the merchants of England, "thoſe princes of the earth;" and in a profeſſion to which arbitrary monarchies deny the privileges and rank of honour, its pureſt principles are carried to a height that is unrivalled in ancient or modern hiſtory. "Their words are bonds, their oaths are oracles."

The effects are worthy of ſo virtuous a cauſe. It is this probity, this perſonal honour, which ſupports the conſequence of Great Britain. It is this reputation, which in other countries it would require ages to eſtabliſh, that has enabled them to raiſe thoſe immenſe individual properties, which invigorate the machine of commerce beyond the efforts of princes, or the calculation of governments. The unbounded credit that Engliſhmen of this deſcription, and they are not a few, may obtain, is an auſpicious, and noble feature in the national character. The merchants of other nations ſink in compariſon before them; to theſe men, Sir, intereſt ſhould teach the Americans to look up for ancient connection, and effectual aſſiſtance. Such men as you may ſmooth the difficulties which impede the renewal of

friendſhip

friendſhip and credit, by ſtrictly fulfilling the articles of your public treaty; and by ſetting that example of probity in your own perſons, which it is the advantage of the community to adopt.

The Tranſlator has informed the world, that the preſſure of a ſevere domeſtic calamity has led you to ſeek relief in public buſineſs: misfortune is the great link that connects the higheſt and the loweſt of mankind; and ſympathy of ſuffering continually reminds us of our original equality. The reſpectable preſident, Lawrence, has born his teſtimony to this remark; and your conduct, I hope, will be an illuſtration of it in a ſimilar diſtreſs: the "Bellum inter remedia," ſignalized a great character of antiquity. May a nobler activity diſtinguiſh Mr. Jefferſon! The re-eſtabliſhment of a *real Family Compact*. The Family Compact is a tye, which from one family poſſeſſing abſolute power therein, actuates ſtates and kingdoms contrary to their ſeparate intereſts; it connects and points their force at the will of the chief of it, the French monarch.

As far as the intereſts of nations are ſuperior to thoſe of kings, a Family Com-

pact, in greater luſtre, and more extenſive meaning, would be created by an union of force and of commerce between Great Britain, Ireland *, and America. No unneceſſary wars would diſturb the world by this junction; the ambition of each country being confined to its internal improvement, and the reciprocal circulation of its commerce. They are of one origin, language, manners, and freedom of government. A-

* The Tranſlator ſays, "on more than one imminent occaſion Congreſs owed their exiſtence, and America poſſibly her preſervation, to the fidelity and firmneſs of the Iriſh. I had the honour of dining with the Iriſh Society, compoſed of the ſteadieſt Whigs upon the continent, at the City Tavern, in Philadelphia, on St. Patrick's day. The members wear a medallion, ſuſpended by a ribband, with a very ſignificant device, which was ſo applicable to the American Revolution, that until I was aſſured that it ſubſiſted prior to that event, and had reference only to the oppreſſion of Ireland by her powerful ſiſter, I concluded it to be a temporary *illuſion*." The reader will give as much credit as he pleaſes to this recital; but I doubt not he will agree with me, that the error of the preſs is an admirable one; that temporary *illuſion* may be truly ſaid of all that can diſturb the harmony of Great Britain and Ireland, notwithſtanding the implied wiſhes of the Tranſlator. This error, *illuſion* for alluſion, reminds me of the painter, who threw the ſpunge at his picture in deſpair, and produced a more *true* effect by accident than he could accompliſh by deſign.

way

way then with the remembrance of the late war and its individual miſeries. Let Great Britain and America purſue their proper advantages; they will ſoon lead to reconciliation: let all retroſpect be avoided; let all harſh and aggravating expreſſions ceaſe; and ſuch incendiaries as the Tranſlator of the Marquis de Chaſtellux's Memoirs be treated with deſerved contempt. This conduct religion recommends, and hiſtory points out in the moſt forcible manner to Britons and their American deſcendants. For who amongſt us, moſt converſant in the annals of our country, and glowing with the pureſt ſpirit of liberty, can praiſe the uniform conduct of any one patriot in thoſe civil wars to which we have been indebted for our freedom? Or who can ſay, had I lived in thoſe times of neceſſary conteſt, ſo far would I have gone, and no farther? And yet what thinking man is not grateful to the Supreme Being, who, out of the probation and miſeries of our anceſtors, has diſtributed ſo much civil and religious liberty to the preſent generation?

FINIS.

6 MA 65